```
MABGDEN1
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
     -----x
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                             20 Cr. 623 (JSR)
                V.
5
     WILLIE DENNIS,
6
                                             Trial
                    Defendant.
 7
        -----x
 8
                                             New York, N.Y.
9
                                             October 11, 2022
                                             11:30 a.m.
10
     Before:
11
12
                           HON. JED S. RAKOFF,
13
                                             District Judge
                                              and a Jury
14
                               APPEARANCES
15
     DAMIAN WILLIAMS
          United States Attorney for the
16
          Southern District of New York
17
     SARAH KUSHNER
     STEPHANIE SIMON
     KIMBERLY RAVENER
18
          Assistant United States Attorney
19
     WILLIE DENNIS, Pro Se
20
     Also Present:
21
     Colleen Geier, Paralegal
     Elisabeth Wheeler, FBI
22
     Elizabeth Caruso, Interpreter (Spanish)
     Elizabeth Ilaakostos, Interpreter (Spanish)
23
24
25
```

```
1
               (In open court; jury not present)
               THE COURT: This is United States v. Dennis.
 2
 3
               Counsel for the government please identify themselves.
 4
               MS. KUSHNER: Good morning, your Honor.
 5
      Kushner, Stephanie Simon and Kimberly Ravener on behalf of the
6
      government. And also at counsel table is also FBI Special
 7
      Agent Elisabeth Wheeler.
               THE COURT: Good morning. So it is now 11:25.
8
9
     Mr. Dennis was informed in our last conference on the record
10
      that this matter would begin promptly at 11:15. He is not yet
      here. We will wait a reasonable amount of time. But if he
11
12
      doesn't show, of course, we'll need to take appropriate action,
13
     but let's see what happens.
14
               What was the last contact that anyone at government
15
      table had with Mr. Dennis?
               MR. DENNIS: He emailed the government this morning
16
17
      asking for the courtroom address.
18
               THE COURT: When was that, approximately?
19
               MR. DENNIS: It was approximately an hour ago. And we
20
      responded right away.
21
               THE COURT: All right.
22
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Does he have the courtroom number?
23
               MR. DENNIS: It was an hour and a half ago, closer to
24
                  And we and your law clerk provided the address.
      two hours.
25
                           I hope it won't be necessary, but has the
               THE COURT:
```

```
government now prepared a bench warrant?
1
 2
               MS. SIMON: We're working on it, your Honor.
 3
               (Pause)
 4
               LAW CLERK: We just got an email from Mr. Dennis.
 5
      says, I'm a little delayed. I expect to be at the courthouse
      in the next 15 minutes.
6
 7
               So that would be by 11:45 a.m.
 8
               (Pause)
9
               THE COURT: Where do we stand on that bench warrant?
10
               MS. SIMON: It's being prepared by our office now.
11
      And with the Court's permission, we would submit it by email.
12
      Would that be possible?
13
               THE COURT: Yes, that's possible. But this normally
     would take, on a slow day, about two minutes to prepare.
14
               MS. SIMON: We're having some connectivity issues here
15
      in the courtroom, your Honor. And that's why someone back in
16
17
      our office is preparing it.
18
               THE COURT: Have you ever heard of the telephone? Who
19
      is it you want to reach?
20
                          They are already preparing it.
               MS. SIMON:
21
               THE COURT: You just tell them that I want it here in
22
      five minutes or less.
23
               MS. SIMON: Yes, your Honor.
24
               Would your Honor like us to send it to the chambers
25
      address or to Mr. Kern?
```

THE COURT: Send it to Mr. Kern.

MS. SIMON: We just sent it to you.

THE COURT: So I will give the signed arrest warrant to the government. It is now 11:45, so it's a half hour since Mr. Dennis was supposed to appear. My law clerk said he sent an email saying he would be here at approximately 11:45. We will wait no more than 15 additional minutes.

(Pause)

MABGDEN1

MS. SIMON: Pretrial just provided an address to us. It's the west side Y M C A at --

THE COURT: Here is the defendant.

Take a seat at the second table, Mr. Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Apologies, your Honor. I was delayed downstairs, your Honor, because they took my cell phone and my iPad.

THE COURT: Yes, as they will with every single human being who goes through this court, except upon order of the court. But we'll take that up later, because it is now almost 12:00 o'clock. This matter was called for 11:15, and we're going to bring up the jury panel right now.

MR. DENNIS: My apologies, your Honor. My parents had an issue with their medication this morning. As you know, I am their primary caretaker. So I had to get on the phone with them. The person who was stepping in for me did not come. So I had to make sure they got their medication. This is their

first day without me helping them with that process, so it got a little confused. So I apologize.

Your Honor, during the jury portion, jury selection, does the government have their devices?

THE COURT: They have previously obtained permission. If you would like permission, I will consider that.

MR. DENNIS: I think I'm at a severe disadvantage, your Honor.

THE COURT: No, you're not at a severe disadvantage because you have paid no attention to the rules of this court. If you had done even the most basic research, you would have known you needed the court's permission because it has been the rule of this court for at least the last dozen years that, for security reasons, no person entering this court can keep their electronic equipment, except upon prior express order of the court. But I am happy, if you wish, to execute such an order in your case. But don't tell me about unfairness when you have created the situation.

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, I object and disagree.

Because once again, as we have discussed before, I am

representing myself pro se. So there are three government

attorneys sitting here, and I am — the only reason why I raise

this issue is because you are saying if I do this and if I do

that. I'm doing a lot. They have three attorneys, they have

paralegals, they have secretaries. And in my instance, it's

just me, my mother and father and my iPad.

THE COURT: So the point is that, during this trial, the rule of law, including the rules of this court, will be in full stead. Now, Mr. Dennis, to be frank, you have a long history of violating my rules. The most recent one being just this past weekend. I have told you at least a dozen times — and of course, it's in my individual rules as well — not to send emails to the Court. But rather, if you have an application, to make it through a joint telephone call with the government. And that seems to have not made any difference to you.

MR. DENNIS: I object, your Honor, again. As is in the prior record, I was being -- I was -- Judge Schofield was presiding over this. I am a pro se representative --

THE COURT: Mr. -- go ahead, finish.

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, 60 days before trial, I've had a new judge come in, who is now insisting that any violation of all of his rules — that I have to learn all of his new rules, and he knows that I'm representing myself prose.

THE COURT: Now, there is one rule -- stop faking.

MR. DENNIS: Excuse me, your Honor. I object.

THE COURT: Well, I'm going to tell you.

MR. DENNIS: I object.

THE COURT: There is only one rule that I've told you

to abide by. And I told it to you the very first day we had our first conference. And I have told it to you again and again and again, which is not to send emails, but to convene — if you have an application — convene a joint conference with the government and the Court, which has been my universal rule for 26 years. And it makes a lot of sense, for reasons I'll get to in a minute. But that's one rule. It's one very simple rule. So what is this stuff about, oh, the case was transferred and I had to learn all sorts of new rules? It was one rule, and you seem incapable of abiding by it.

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, it's so that it's on the record, when I emailed the Court was yesterday, Monday, as I was traveling and could not get on a phone, was having problems with my — with my cell phone, as I informed pretrial repeatedly, and the only request that I made was that my parents be able to participate, who I have been — I'm the primary caretaker for, have been for the entire time. And your Honor has that in his record, that I take care of their medicine. Your Honor has it in the record that my mother almost died twice during this period. So the only thing that — going outside of your rules was yesterday asking if you would give them permission to be able to participate via audio, in the event of my conviction, being that they're 87 and 81 years of age, they may never see me again. So I'm sorry that I offended your Honor by making that request given the

circumstances I was under yesterday.

THE COURT: So let's, again, get the record straight.

As you yourself pointed out in your email, this was something that you should have brought up at the conference we held on Friday where, to accommodate you and your parents and your care for your parents, I allowed you to appear telephonically over the government's objection. And then you waited until late yesterday. And out of respect for your parents and only out of respect for your parents, I once again, as I have so often, did not enforce my rule, but rather responded to your request saying that I was sympathetic to your request, but that I needed to hear from the government, which we will hear from in a minute.

So the rules are not to be made by you. They are not to be made, oh, well, I'm traveling so I don't have to abide by your rules with respect to a request that I could have made the previous Friday, but Judge, now I'm traveling. So I'm going to ignore your rule. That will not do in my court. So let me just make it clear and then we'll move on to the substance.

If I receive from any party in this case any email between now and the end of the case, I will consider holding that person in contempt of court, which could mean, among other things, revocation of bail.

Now --

MR. DENNIS: Just so I'm clear, your Honor, so right

now, I'm on trial and basically facing five years in prison because I sent emails that the government is claiming injured and harassed them. And now you are saying, basically, that if I violate one of your rules, even if it's -- particularly, if it's relating to my parents and their health, that you will possibly revoke my bail and send me to jail for that?

THE COURT: I'm telling you that because you are a serial violator of the one and only rule that I have stressed, that if you do it again, you may pay the consequences.

Now, why do I have that rule?

MR. DENNIS: I object. I'm not a serial violator.

THE COURT: Your objection is duly noted, but you better not send another email.

MR. DENNIS: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: So the reason I have this rule is really for your benefit as much as anyone's. Because had you convened a telephone call at any time between Friday and yesterday, I could have gotten the government's position, and then I could have ruled. And if I had ruled in your favor, we could have set up the equipment. But that's the reason I have the rule, so I can deal expeditiously with any application made by any party. And every party, including pro se parties, have had no difficulty abiding by that rule for the last 26 years until you, Mr. Dennis.

Now, let's turn to the merits.

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, before -- I'm sitting back
here. Is there a reason why I'm not sitting closer to -
THE COURT: Yes. Because defendants always sit at the second table.

MR. DENNIS: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Now, what is the government's position with respect to the request that Mr. Dennis' parents be plugged in by video to these proceedings?

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, the government objects. It's a fairly extraordinary application to ask that a jury trial be video streamed. Of course, even when a witness, under extreme circumstances, has to testify remotely, there are procedures and standards in place. And here, we do not think that this is an extraordinary reason justifying the video broadcast of a jury trial involving sensitive issues.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this, Mr. Dennis, the one concern I have about video -- in addition to that it's very unusual in these circumstances -- but one concern I have about video is it would be totally improper for the jury to be seeing your parents 24/7 or whatever the time was of the trial, because that would introduce an element to the case that was not there.

So what about the telephone connection so they can hear everything that's going on?

MR. DENNIS: That would be fine, your Honor.

```
THE COURT: That would be fine?
1
               MR. DENNIS: Yes.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: All right. I will see -- because we're
 4
      running late, I had wanted to try to contact audiovisual people
 5
      earlier -- but I'll see what I can do to set up -- they
6
      understand that they won't be able to talk, they'll just be
 7
      able to listen; you understand that?
               MR. DENNIS: Yes.
8
9
               THE COURT: I think my feeling on this is that -- as I
10
      have tried to do throughout the case since it was assigned to
11
     me -- we have to give accommodation to Mr. Dennis' parents and
12
      the unhappy situation that they are in, both health-wise and
13
      otherwise. And so I think it would not be inappropriate to set
14
      up a telephone link so they could listen to the trial. So I
15
      will do my best to arrange that during the lunch break today.
               MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, I was going to take notes on
16
17
     my iPad, but I don't have it right now.
18
               THE COURT: I'm sorry, do you need a pen?
19
               MR. DENNIS: Yes.
20
               THE COURT: If someone would give him a pen, please.
21
               MR. DENNIS: Thank you.
22
               THE COURT: Now, in terms of your equipment, you have
23
      a cell phone and an iPad; is that what was taken from you?
24
               MR. DENNIS: Yes, your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: Any objection from the government to the
```

Court issuing the order allowing him to keep those during the course of this trial?

MR. DENNIS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I'll ask my law clerk to prepare such an order during the lunch break, and you'll be able during the lunch break then to retrieve them, Mr. Dennis.

Now, I think the only other pending matter we have was there was one outstanding issue regarding a subpoena. Namely, this was the subpoena that Mr. Dennis had propounded to Bradford Smith, the chairman of Microsoft. His process server was unable to serve Mr. Smith, so he asked, Mr. Dennis asked if he could serve him by mail. This was an application made on Friday when I didn't have a copy of the subpoena in front of me.

I had previously approved, as I had approved every last one of Mr. Dennis' subpoenas for service --

MR. DENNIS: Sorry, your Honor, one issue. What we talked about at the last hearing was that I was going to be able to respond as to why I needed Mr. Smith.

THE COURT: Yes. You told me that your process server had tried to get in there and had not been successful.

MR. DENNIS: Right. So all my notes relating to that manner and the conversation we're about to have is on my iPad.

THE COURT: Well, do you want to hold off until we get your iPad?

MR. DENNIS: Yes, please. THE COURT: We'll do that. Now, one of the most unfortunate things about the defendant's delay was we were originally going to have the jury panel at 11:30 and we had to excuse them because we didn't know when you were going to appear, so my courtroom deputy is, I think, checking on that. But let me ask my law clerk to go check with her and see what the story is. There they are. (Recess)

MabWden2

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, you are our jury to try this case. In a few minutes, we're going to swear you in and then excuse you for lunch, and then when you come back we'll start with the opening statements of counsel and the first witness. But let me give you a few sort of housekeeping details.

First, you should not discuss this case with anyone outside. You may have to tell an employer or a spouse or someone like that you're going to be on jury service for about a week, but when they inevitably say, oh, tell us about the case, you have to say no, I'm sorry; I can't discuss the case. And the reason for that is we want you to decide this case based solely and wholly on the evidence that you hear here in the courtroom. The evidence will consist of testimony. It will consist of exhibits. Once in a while there's also something called a stipulation, where the parties agree to a fact. Those are the only sources of evidence, and it will help you to focus just on that, not to discuss with someone who hasn't been here and doesn't know any of the evidence in the case.

The second rule, which is a little less obvious, is that you should not discuss the case even among yourselves until it's given to you for your deliberations at the close of all the evidence. And the reason for that rule is that the evidence will come in one witness at a time, one document at a

MabWden2

time, and it will a while until you have the whole picture, and we don't want you to start making up your mind until you have heard all of the evidence. So don't even discuss the case among yourselves until it's given to you for your deliberations.

A third rule, which, again, is probably quite obvious, don't try to do your own research. Don't Google anything about the case or cyberstalking or anything like that. We'll give you everything you need to know here in the courtroom, and that's what you need to decide the case on.

And finally, really a rule for the parties and the lawyers, but I want you to be aware of it, is they are under very strict orders to have no contact with you. So if you're in the elevator and there's one of the lawyers or parties and they don't even smile and say hello, it's not that they're being rude. It's because they're under very strict orders to have no contact with you whatsoever.

Now, we're going to excuse you. You'll initially go into the jury room. My courtroom deputy will take some contact information, and then you'll be excused for lunch. We'll give you a full hour for lunch, and then we'll resume about 2:15 and hear the opening statements of counsel.

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, because I have to retrieve my iPad and --

THE COURT: Yes, we'll take care of that.

MR. DENNIS: -- can we have a little more time? 1 OK. We'll give you an hour and a guarter 2 THE COURT: 3 for lunch. I'm sure we can do that for you quite swiftly. 4 MR. DENNIS: OK. 5 THE COURT: So we'll start again at 2:30, in which 6 case we won't take a midafternoon break. We'll just go from 7 2:30 to 4:30 this afternoon. But now we need to swear you in. 8 (A jury of twelve and three alternates was impaneled 9 and sworn) THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please follow me into the jury 10 11 room. 12 (Jury not present) 13 THE COURT: Mr. Dennis, if you want to wait here, 14 we'll get you that order right away and have someone escort you down to security so you can get your electronic equipment right 15 16 away. 17 We will convene promptly at 2:30. 18 MS. KUSHNER: Your Honor, can we raise four brief 19 issues? 20 THE COURT: Yes. 21 MS. KUSHNER: Just to be clear -- all the proposed 22 instructions reflect this -- the government is not proceeding 23 on Count Three of the indictment, and we would move to dismiss 24 that count.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Say this again.

MS. KUSHNER: It's a four-count indictment. 1 THE COURT: Yes. 2 3 MS. KUSHNER: The government is not proceeding on 4 Count Three. 5 THE COURT: Oh, I wondered that from your proposed 6 jury instructions. So Count Three is dismissed. 7 MS. KUSHNER: Thank you. We just want to clarify that while the defendant will 8 9 have his iPad and phone here there won't be any recording 10 through any of those devices during the course of the trial. 11 THE COURT: Yes. He's nodding affirmatively. 12 MR. DENNIS: Affirmative. 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 MS. KUSHNER: Third, while no plea offer was ever 15 extended, because the defendant expressed absolutely no interest in it, a Pimentel letter was provided to the 16 17 defendant. THE COURT: I'm sorry. For some reason I'm having a 18 19 little trouble hearing you. 20 MS. KUSHNER: I'm sorry. I pushed the microphone 21 away. 22 While no plea offer was ever extended to the 23 defendant, because he expressed no interest in that, a Pimentel 24 letter was provided, and even before that, since December of 25 2021, the defendant has been informed that the government would MabWden2

oppose a one-point reduction at sentencing if defendant were to proceed to trial.

THE COURT: Yes, but I might as well tell Mr. Dennis what the government already knows, I don't pay any attention to the guidelines. I think the guidelines are totally irrational, so you may have a guideline range that's up to the wazoo, it won't affect my sentence one way or the other. Of course, you may be acquitted, but if you're convicted, what I will look at is, first and foremost, the human being that I'm about to sentence — that's always the most important thing to me; and secondly, the victims and how they were affected. Those two factors weigh far more with me than any of this arithmetic mumbo-jumbo that the sentencing commission engages in. But nevertheless, I'm glad to know that it's on the record that a Pimentel letter has been provided.

OK. Yes.

MS. KUSHNER: And the fourth matter is we just want to alert the Court that one of the pending motions in limine the issue is going to become relevant with the second witness, and the first witness is going to be relatively short. So if the Court wants to put aside time to address it, we're ready.

THE COURT: OK. Go ahead.

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, I still have to get my -THE COURT: I'll tell you what. Why don't you all
come back at 2:20 instead of 2:30.

MabWden2

It's going to take you five minutes. Were you planning on more than an hour for lunch?

MR. DENNIS: No. I was planning on, actually, I didn't have my notes to sort of incorporate what I've got into my notes.

THE COURT: OK. Come back at 2:25 then. I think we can deal with this in five minutes. I don't want to ever detain the jury. The jury are the most important people in this courtroom, and they were told to come back at 2:30.

I did want to state on the record Mr. Dennis handed up three proposed questions. The first one was: "Every person looks at the world through a lens colored by their life experiences. My question is if you have had any experience in your life that will make it hard for you to be fair when you hear and see the evidence through the lens of your life's experience."

I did not give that first request because I thought it was too rhetorical and vague, but I did, of course, the ask the jurors at the end whether there was anything that I hadn't covered that made them think they couldn't serve as a fair and impartial juror, so I think the substance of it was, in effect, given.

The second question was: "You have not heard any evidence. Do you have feelings already about how business is done in the large international law firms that would make it

hard for you to hear the evidence fairly to me?"

I think that is nothing but an argument disguised as a question, and so I rejected that.

The third one was: "I want you to think for a moment about the meaning of the expression 'beyond a reasonable doubt.' Do you think you can listen to the evidence and then determine guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?"

Actually, I gave a stronger version of that at the very outset. As you may recall, the very first thing I said to the jury was that the bedrock principle of our law is that a defendant is presumed innocent until and unless the government proves his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. And of course, I will give them instructions at the end about what we mean by reasonable doubt. So I think as to No. 3, that was more than covered.

I'll have my law clerk hand this back to Mr. Dennis, because there were also some handwritten notes that I don't want to keep. Those are yours.

OK. Very good. We'll see you at 2:25.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ DENNIS: Your Honor, will you send, will someone be able to send --

THE COURT: Yes. We're going to work on that right now.

(Luncheon recess)

AFTERNOON SESSION

2:25 p.m.

(In open court; jury not present)

THE COURT: Does the government want to be heard?

MS. SIMON: The government wanted to preview an issue for the court that was raised in the motion in limine, specifically, the government expects to elicit from its second witness testimony regarding two in-person interactions that the witness had with the defendant. And I expect the witness will testify regarding an incident where the defendant approached him at a professional conference, and then the defendant sent him over 20 text messages over the course of one night. That included the text message, I will find you. And then the next day shows up and in fact found the witness.

In addition, I expect that the witness will testify, after that incident, he blocked the defendant's phone number. But the evidence I expect will show that the defendant attempted to get in touch with this witness after that point and that several months after, there was another in-person interaction where the defendant approached the witness at another professional conference.

The government thinks this is direct evidence of the charged crimes. It puts the messages that the defendant sent to the victim in context. And it contextualizes both the victim's own understanding of the messages when he received

them and the reasonableness of his belief that the messages were annoying, harassing and threatening and also speaks to the defendant's intent.

THE COURT: Now, for the reasons I already sort of expressed in connection with the motions in limine, I really don't think I can rule on that until I hear what leads up to it. So when you get to the questions that raise this, say, Judge, we're about to get to it and we'll have a sidebar and I'll hear from the defendant as well, and then I'll rule.

MS. SIMON: Of course, that's fine, your Honor. The government is happy to proceed that way if your Honor prefers. I just wanted to make clear that it's going to come fairly early in the witness' testimony, and the lead in will be something to the effect of, after the defendant stopped working at the law firm, did you see the defendant again.

THE COURT: The answer to that is yes.

MS. SIMON: Yes.

THE COURT: That's not the end of the testimony.

MS. SIMON: Certainly not, your Honor, but the context will be --

THE COURT: If you want to, let's take that as an example. So the answer the witness gives is yes, what's your next question?

MS. SIMON: Where was that.

THE COURT: And the answer is?

MS. KUSHNER: At a professional conference. 1 What's your next question? 2 THE COURT: 3 MS. SIMON: And what happened. 4 And he will explain the nature of the interaction with 5 the defendant, and then the in-person interaction with the 6 defendant. And then he'll explain that, after that 7 interaction, that in-person interaction, he received several text messages from the defendant that night and then very early 8 9 the next morning. 10 THE COURT: The interaction was of an antagonistic 11 sort? 12 MS. SIMON: Yes, your Honor. 13 So what's he going to say in that regard? THE COURT: 14 That's what I need to know. 15 MS. SIMON: I apologize, your Honor. I expect the witness will testify that the defendant approached him at this 16 17 professional conference and started yelling at him and was 18 raising several of his grievances about the firm and with the 19 witness in particular in a way that the witness found to be 20 intimidating. 21 THE COURT: I think that sounds like appropriate 22 background, so I will allow it. 23 MS. SIMON: Thank you, your Honor. 24 MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, there's one thing I would

like to ask of the Court. Given that I'm representing myself

pro se and that minutes before one of the witnesses -- one of the government's witnesses is going to testify, I'm hearing new information, I'm requesting in advance now the opportunity to go home and to prepare my cross-examination questions of this witness.

THE COURT: Denied.

Let's bring in the jury, and we'll hear opening statements.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: I'm missing one, Judge. I have her cell phone, so I can call her right this second and see where she is.

THE COURT: I know that right after we broke last, the defendant was able to recover his electronic equipment.

And let me ask my law clerk, where do we stand on the telephone connection to the parents?

LAW CLERK: They are hearing us.

THE COURT: So that's been done. Great.

So I think the only other open matter is the subpoena that, Mr. Dennis, you wanted a chance to look at your laptop before we discuss that. Are you ready to discuss that now?

MR. DENNIS: Yes, I am, your Honor.

THE COURT: So through no fault of his own, Mr. Dennis and his process server were not able to serve the head of Microsoft. And so he has applied to have that service made by mail.

The problem that we confront here is that the request, at least for documents, are similar to requests that I have already held not to be the proper subject of a subpoena because they're not likely to lead to admissible evidence. For example, we have a whole bunch of requests about the no contact list — and I won't belabor the record by going through why that is — while it's part of this case, it's not part of this trial. But this is also a request for Mr. Bradford Smith's personal appearance.

What is it you would suggest he would testify to?

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, with respect to Mr. Smith,
he's different from any of the other Microsoft executives.

THE COURT: Can you bring the microphone just a little bit closer to you.

MR. DENNIS: Yes, sorry.

THE COURT: You can sit down, but just bring it closer to you.

MR. DENNIS: He's different from any of the other Microsoft executives because I've known Brad for over 20 years. And so I've known him both professionally and personally. So by him being placed on the no -- and he was on my witness list in the arbitration, because I expected him to be a witness to testify on my behalf -- by putting him on the no contact list, the government precluded me from having conversations with someone who would have been a witness on my behalf.

THE COURT: But my question is -- we've been through that, and as you will recall, when you finally raised on Friday, after many invitations from me to do so, the no contact list, and I gave you permission then to contact the counsel for the witnesses on the no contact list who were represented by counsel and see if their clients wanted to talk to you. But what is it you think -- to be continued.

(Continued on next page)

(Jury present)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're about to hear opening statements from counsel. I want to caution you at the beginning that nothing that the lawyers or the parties say in opening statements is evidence. As I mentioned before, the evidence comes from testimony, from exhibits, and there may be something called stipulations. Those are the only sources of evidence.

So you may ask, why do we even have opening statements. Well, the answer, again, is the evidence is going to come in a little bit at a time. And so counsel are going to give you their overview -- by "counsel," I'm including Mr. Dennis in his role as counsel, in that he's representing himself -- they're going to give you an overview of what they think the evidence may prove or may fail to prove. So this is a chance to give you a kind of roadmap as to where they think the evidence is going. And they will, doubtless, have different views of that, but by hearing their respective positions, it will give you a little bit of context to evaluate the evidence as it begins to come in.

I want to remind you that the government bears the burden to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, and so they will go first. And I also want to remind you that the basic charges in this case relate to the alleged use of emails and text messages for purposes of conveying threats or intimidation

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28

or other material likely to cause substantial emotional harm and that the standard has to be not only that that occurred, but also that the defendant intended that that would occur.

So against that background, let's hear first from the government.

MS. SIMON: Thank you, your Honor.

Sleep with one eye open. We are coming for you. will find you. These are just a small fraction of the thousands of messages that the defendant sent to his former coworkers over the course of two years. He harassed them in the middle of the night, bombarded them with messages back to back to back.

When the victims got the defendant's messages, they were anxious. They were distressed. They were even scared. They didn't know what the defendant might do. They thought the defendant might come to their home or office and that he might even hurt them.

The defendant's messages upended the victims' lives. That is why we are here today, because that man, the defendant, Willie Dennis, engaged in a year's long campaign to harass, intimidate and threaten his former colleagues at the law firm where he used to work. For that, he's charged with cyberstalking. It's time to hold him accountable for what he did.

This opening statement is the government's opportunity

to give you a preview of what I expect you are going to hear and see over the coming days. First, I will address what I expect the evidence will show. Second, I will address how the government will prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty.

So what will the evidence show?

The evidence will show that the defendant was a partner at a big law firm. At some point, he became upset with the firm and he started to send hostile repetitive emails to his coworkers. The sheer number of those messages was disruptive to the workplace. The defendant was asked to stop multiple times, but he refused.

After the defendant stopped working at the law firm, you'll learn, his conduct escalated. He began to flood his former coworkers, including the three victims in this case, with thousands of disturbing text messages and emails. In those messages, the defendant called the victims degrading names; rat, gutter rat, piece of shit, cotton head. He falsely accused them of illicit sexual conduct. He threatened their families. He threatened their careers. He claimed to invoke the wrath of god against his victims. He said that in the Bible's words, his victims would be cut down and destroyed. He even invoked the horrors of mass shootings, implying that his victims might suffer the same fate.

Sometimes his messages contained explicit threats like

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Opening - Ms. Simon

the ones I mentioned earlier; sleep with one eye open, I will find you. Other times, the defendant's messages were more The defendant did not always spell out exactly what cryptic. he meant. But that was part of the point, to keep the victims quessing, unsettled, uncomfortable.

You will learn that the defendant sent his victims multiple disturbing messages, often in rapid succession. You'll learn that one victim received over 20 messages in the course of a single evening. Other victims, you'll learn, received thousands of messages from the defendant over the course of two years; sometimes over a hundred in a day. victims did not respond to the defendant's messages, but the defendant continued to pummel them with unwanted messages anyway, again and again and again.

You will see that the victims' lives were disrupted by the defendant's endless barrage of messages. Not only that, they were also afraid; afraid that the defendant might do something violent. So they took steps to protect themselves.

One victim started wearing shoes with treads when he was on the subway so he would be ready to run in case the defendant snuck up on him. Another victim started sleeping with a loaded gun under his pillow after the defendant threatened to come to his home. Another victim moved to a completely different state to get away from the defendant. That's how scared they were.

You will learn that the volume of the defendant's messages were so overwhelming and their contents so disturbing that one of the victims blocked the defendant's cell phone number. Others feared that if they blocked the defendant's number and stopped seeing his messages, they wouldn't be ready if the defendant actually acted on his threats, so they continued to receive his messages day after day, despite the fear and pain those messages caused.

Now, I expect you will also hear that the defendant had various grievances with his former law firm. I expect you will learn that more than a year after he stopped working at the firm, the defendant sued, and that lawsuit is still ongoing. But don't be distracted. That's not what this case is about.

This case is about what the defendant did to the victims. It's about the messages he sent them, how he terrorized them.

As a result, the defendant is charged with three counts of cyberstalking; one count for each targeted victim in this case.

So how will the government prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt?

You will see the defendant's own words for yourselves.

You will see many of the harassing, intimidating and even

threatening messages the defendant sent. You will see how the

defendant inundated the victims with messages late into the night, early in the morning, sometimes for days and even weeks at a time.

You will also hear from the victims directly. They will tell you about the awful, abusive messages they received from the defendant, how those messages invaded and disrupted their everyday lives, how they were forced to take steps to protect themselves.

You will also hear from law enforcement officers, including the officer who arrested the defendant and seized his cell phone and the FBI technician who extracted the defendant's harassing messages from that very same cell phone. You will also see records connecting the defendant to that cell phone and other email accounts that were used to send more harassing messages.

What I have just described to you is just an overview of what I expect the evidence will show. The actual evidence will come in one piece at a time. No single witness or single message can give you the full story of what the defendant did. But as the trial goes on, you will watch as each piece of evidence helps to build the full picture of the defendant's crimes.

So as you hear and see the evidence throughout the course of the trial, I'm going to ask you to do three things: First, pay close attention to the evidence; second, follow

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Judge Rakoff's instructions on the law; and third, use your common sense, the same common sense you use every day to make all sorts of decisions in your own lives. If you do those three things, you will reach the only verdict that is consistent with the law, the evidence and your common sense, that Willie Dennis is quilty. THE COURT: Thank you very much. Now we will hear from Mr. Dennis. MR. DENNIS: Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. And thank you for taking the time to serve as jurors as I try to avoid being sent to prison. MS. SIMON: Objection, your Honor. MR. DENNIS: I have never done any of this before. THE COURT: I'm sorry, I didn't hear. MR. DENNIS: Excuse me. MS. SIMON: I'm sorry, there was an objection, your Honor. THE COURT: I didn't hear what he said right before What are you objecting to? that. I avoid trying to be sent to prison, your MS. SIMON: Honor. THE COURT: I see.

for the Court, not for you. So don't be concerned about

So ladies and gentlemen, the question of any

punishment if the defendant is convicted is purely a question

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Opening - Mr. Dennis

punishment in any way, shape or form. That will be something that, if and only if the defendant is convicted, the judge gets to decide.

Go ahead.

MR. DENNIS: I've never done any of this before, so you're probably going to hear more objections as I go through this. But more importantly, I'm going to ask you to excuse me because I have made a lot of -- I've made notes. And we'll have to refer to them often to stay organized, as I make my opening statements.

The evidence will show that I am the son of two hardworking parents. My father worked for the New York City Sanitation Department behind the truck for 31 years, who invested most of their hard-earned money to provide me, my brother and my sister with food, shelter and a good education.

I graduated from Columbia College and then Columbia Law School. And I worked during college and law school to help pay the way through. Then I practiced for over 30 years in New York City at some of the highly regarded firms, including a firm where I started at, which was called Mudge Rose Guthrie Alexander & Ferdon, where I was personally trained by a gentleman by the name of Robert Ferdon, who, as your Honor can confirm, was one of the most respected attorneys in America for his legal skills and his ethical standards. And I worked at the law firms of Akin Gump and K&L Gates, which K&L Gates is

one of the top firms in the country, in the world. It's the fifth largest law firm in the United States.

The evidence will show that during my 30-year career, I developed strong relationships and brought to the firm many millions of dollars in business with Fortune 500 companies including Microsoft, Goldman Sachs, Dupont, MetLife, American Express, Tyco, Toys "R" Us and Darden Restaurants, to name a few. If you don't know Darden, Darden is really more well known for being a Red Lobster or Olive Garden, if any of you know those chains.

The prosecution has read its charges against me, and these charges give the burden to the prosecution to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that I sent emails to four of my former partners at K&L Gates with the intent to intimidate or cause fear in these four individuals. The evidence will show that I actually sent these emails to many, many more partners at K&L Gates, not just the four that the prosecution is focused on in this courtroom. And that my intention in sending these emails was not to intimidate or to strike fear in any of them. The evidence will show my purpose was to act like a reasonable partner of the firm of K&L Gates and put the partners on notice of very specific misconduct some of them had been doing individually against me and some being against the interest of the firm.

The evidence will show that I was concerned about two

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

things: One was the firm's public reputation for tolerating sexual harassment and gender discrimination; a second was that a small group of leaders of the firm was violating the firm's bylaws and taking my clients away from me, reducing my clients.

The evidence will show that the American Lawyer, one of the most prestigious publications in the law, published an article --

MS. SIMON: Objection, your Honor.

MR. DENNIS: -- stating, during a multiyear period, every single sexual harassment case made by a woman attorney -- THE COURT: Sustained.

Mr. Dennis, there's no way that's coming into evidence. That's hearsay. I know you are not a trial lawyer, but that's classic hearsay. Please go on to something else.

MR. DENNIS: Okay, your Honor.

The evidence will show that -- testimony from my partners -- that I suggested reforming our process of reviewing sexual harassment allegations before we were sued and hurt financially.

MS. SIMON: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I want to really caution the jury that, as I told you before, nothing that either side says at this point is evidence. Whether the evidence will show what is being now stated or not, we'll see. But I will let Mr. Dennis continue. But I do want to make sure that you understand that

none of this is evidence. The question is what will come from the witnesses and the documents.

Go ahead, Mr. Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: So the evidence -- particularly, I know the prosecution just sort of gave you different things that they allegedly said I've done. But I think what's most important is if you put this in a timeline of what occurred.

So the evidence will show that on January 29th, I emailed the chairman of K&L Gates basically telling him there were \$500 million in lawsuits attributable to Microsoft and notifying them I intended to take this to the full partnership the next morning at 11:00. It will further show that on January 30th at 1:44 a.m. -- and this will be one of the witnesses who will be testifying -- informed me that the firm -- this is less than eight hours later -- had suspended my access to the offices, access to my emails, though the firm continued to pay me, but there was nothing in the partnership agreement that allowed them to do that.

To give you some context, I didn't know if any of you -- it didn't come up during the questioning -- but if any of you had any legal experiences, imagine that one day your lawyer is representing you and then the next day he has no resources; doesn't have a phone, doesn't have access to word processing, but your case is still going on. That day when they did that, when they suspended all my resources, I lost all

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Opening - Mr. Dennis

my clients because I couldn't service them. Clients called me, said what am I doing. I said, look, you have a matter going on, keep going with the firm, don't stop because I'm not there. This is between me and my partners. That was the effect of that.

Almost eight hours later, all of my emails, including those on my message system were removed from all my mobile devices. Almost eight hours after that, I received an email from one of the witnesses who will be testifying today or tomorrow outlining a settlement component.

The evidence will show that 12 days later, on February 11th, with all these other issues still resolved, my wife's divorce attorney received documents from K&L Gates, my partners, mostly about my finances, without my consent or knowledge and without any subpoena being issued. The evidence will show that they sent a letter to my attorney asserting I had harassed them, but stating there was no criminal action being threatened.

The evidence will show on April 16th -- this is 2019 for the timeline, and I'm going in order -- I sent an email to the leadership team and a hundred other partners talking about how we could put in better me too policies, me too policies that would, you know, be helpful for everyone.

The evidence will show that a few months -- a month and a half after that, I was expelled from the firm.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

```
evidence will show -- now we are getting to the point where --
what we discuss is that -- and it says in the indictment,
between September 4th, 2019 and September 27th, 2019, I sent at
least approximately 200 written communications to victims and
other members of the law firm. What it will also show is that
on September 4th at 10:30 p.m. at night, two New York City
police officers --
         MS. SIMON:
                    Objection, your Honor.
         MR. DENNIS: -- my home --
         THE COURT: You know that we discussed this before,
Mr. Dennis.
             That has nothing to do with the issues in this
      Please confine yourself to the issues in this case.
         MR. DENNIS: Can we approach the bench for a second,
your Honor.
         THE COURT: No. Please continue with other parts of
your opening.
         MR. DENNIS: Okay.
         The evidence will show that three weeks later, on
September 24th, I was participating in a women's legal
conference and Chicago --
```

MS. SIMON: Objection.

MR. DENNIS: -- police officers were sent to surveil me --

THE COURT: So ladies and gentlemen, what you are concerned with here is whether or not the government has shown

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that Mr. Dennis did the things that they claim he did. His interactions with police, Chicago or wherever, have nothing to do with what you have to decide. Before a trial begins, all these things get presented to me, and I work them out. And I have already ruled that this has nothing to do with your determination in this case. So please, Mr. Dennis, go on to something that was permissible. MR. DENNIS: Objection, your Honor. I would like to have a conversation with the bench. THE COURT: All right. Come to the bench. (Continued on next page)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MABGden3 Opening - Mr. Dennis

(At sidebar)

MR. DENNIS: So these issues that I'm discussing are issues that each of the witnesses that they're bringing to the stand today are capable of talking about, and I should have the right to cross-examine --

THE COURT: No, this is a question of relevancy. It's not a question of knowledge. It's a question of relevancy. Whether or not police in New York or Chicago, wherever took actions against you that you may feel were improper or intimidating or whatever is an issue that was discussed pretrial, and I ruled that it was irrelevant to the issues that will go before the jury.

And more generally, I granted the motion in limine. There was a specific motion in limine from the government directed at this, which I granted.

Now, I understand you don't agree with all my rulings, so be it. But once I've ruled, I expect you to abide by my rulings. So I think you need to go on to something else.

Now, I allowed you -- actually, the government could have objected to other things in your opening, but they didn't. And I erred on the side of caution, allowed you to get very far into stuff that was borderline. But this is beyond the pale because I have specifically ruled on it. So let's go on.

MR. DENNIS: Just for the record, my understanding was the ruling was in quashing the subpoenas of those individuals

```
MABGden3
                                 Opening - Mr. Dennis
      who I was calling to testify as to these matters.
 1
 2
                (Continued on next page)
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(In open court; jury present)

MR. DENNIS: One of these things I say -- and I echo what the Department of Justice said -- which is in deciding justice, you need to understand the context. Without the context, just saying emails, not understanding what happened before or after the emails makes it difficult to understand. Because I can give you -- probably each one of you has an email with one of your friends in one of your inboxes that says X, Y and Z, I can say, wow, you were threatening that person. But give me the complete context of the relationship, prior, during and after, and then I'll have a better idea of whether or not.

So to continue on with my timeline, the evidence will show that on March 3rd, 2020, I filed a discrimination suit against K&L Gates. And the evidence will show that I received a right to sue letter in August. And then the evidence will show that on October 28th of 2020, a sealed indictment --

MS. SIMON: Objection.

MR. DENNIS: -- this case, was against me without me ever being interviewed.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the last thing you said.

MR. DENNIS: The last thing I said?

(Record read)

THE COURT: I'll allow that.

Go ahead, Mr. Dennis.

Opening - Mr. Dennis

MABGden3

MR. DENNIS: So then on November 3rd, I filed a civil suit against my partners at K&L Gates. And then on November 15th, you know, I filed a -- November 15th, a year later, I filed a witness list with the American Arbitration Association, a year later. And on November 16th, a year and a half later, I was arrested on the sealed indictment from 2020. And the arrest record states that it was my intent to commit homicide. This is now changed to harassment.

So let's go on and talk a little bit -- that's a little bit about the timeline that you're going to hear about. Let's talk about, you know, intent. So first and most importantly, that was never my intent. I was trying to show the best interests of the ranks and file of K&L Gates and to protect my own compensation by insisting on remedying what I considered to be gender discrimination, race discrimination and poor management. The objective proof of my intent is the business contacts, the multiple acts of management which justified my emails.

The prosecution is mainly talked about the number of emails. And I expect, while presenting the case to you, you will read a small portion of only pieces of the emails, not the entire emails. So they will ask you to convict me merely on the content of a portion of a few number of emails without a lot of the extra stuff going on.

As you begin to consider this case, I want you to

consider generally what's going on here. I woke up this morning, and I don't know if you guys saw this bombing that went on in Ukraine --

THE COURT: Would you please put that down.

MR. DENNIS: Okay. But you'll see where I'm going, your Honor, real quickly.

So America is specifically surging in violent crime; assault rifles being used against our children almost on a monthly basis. In our city, violent crimes are being consummated against children, elderly on the subway systems, buses, streets. The perpetrators are without remorse and assailants — who knows. With all this going on outside right now, ask yourself why is the Department of Justice devoting all of these resources —

MS. SIMON: Objection, your Honor.

MR. DENNIS: -- to convict a man who is 60 years old of email harassment, with everything that's going on outside around us right now.

THE COURT: Let me instruct you, ladies and gentlemen. First, of course, this is just one of thousands of criminal cases that are brought every year, and they come with a whole range.

Second and more importantly, the determination of whether to indict someone is made by the grand jury. It's not made by anyone other than persons like yourselves who hear

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

evidence in what's called a grand jury and decide whether or not to go ahead and charge someone with a crime.

Opening - Mr. Dennis

Now, the charge is not proof of quilt beyond a reasonable doubt. That's your job, to determine whether the government has proven quilt beyond a reasonable doubt. But it is the grand jury that decides whether or not to charge someone with a crime. And in this case, they charged this crime.

So the fact that other people may commit other crimes is neither here nor there. That will be a job for another jury or many jurors if cases are brought there, but you're focusing on the case before you.

Go ahead.

MR. DENNIS: I would just remind the jury, which is important, that this is a grand jury that I never got a chance to speak to. I was never interviewed. This is the first time publicly that I'm talking about all this.

But in any event, so the law partners that you are going to see today, just to give you a sense, they're law partners that come from the fifth largest law firm in the world, over 2,000 lawyers across the globe, on the East Coast from Boston to Miami, to Seattle, Chicago; internationally, London, Paris, Beijing. A law firm which has partners that are able to communicate with some of the people in the highest levels of government.

One of my partners is Rosemary Alito. Her brother is

Samuel Alito, the Supreme Court justice.

MS. SIMON: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

I wish, Mr. Dennis, you would go back to -- you were focusing on your intent and that which is relevant to this case. But who might be a sibling of one of your partners is completely irrelevant.

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, I apologize. What I was trying to give the jury was an idea of the people who are about to testify in front of you today, the victims.

THE COURT: You'll have an opportunity to cross-examine the people when they testify.

MR. DENNIS: Okay. All right. So these partners — and we're going to talk about them, but I want to — this is my overview, in terms of what I want you to look for, is this law firm and the partners and myself, we're called in to handle the toughest cases of the largest companies in the US and internationally. So we're accustomed to unleashing some of the harshest attacks on the opponents of our clients; Microsoft, AT&T, whoever they may be. And we have war rooms where we discuss all issues with no holds barred. So this isn't your normal — when one of our largest clients like Microsoft comes in and says, I've got a big problem, they want you to get the army together and get the army marching.

So understanding that as the environment that we all

work in, including the people who are going to testify today and tomorrow, it makes you — one of the questions that you have to consider is, what was it in an email that would intimidate people like this. So let me give you a little background about some of the people who are going to be testifying.

Eric Cottle, litigation partner for over 20 years, okay. He does toxic tort claims, including the representation of companies in asbestos, silica and led pigmentation. Let me translate what that means to you because I was at the firm, we represent companies like that. You have asbestos that cause you cancer. We're the law firm that has to go to court and say, you know what, this person did it on their own. They caused their problem, so don't blame my client just because there was asbestos, it's this individual. And we will do it and he has done it, where he knows that the person who is making the claim is only going to be testifying through videotape because they're going to be dead by the time the case comes to trial.

MS. SIMON: Objection, your Honor.

MR. DENNIS: That is the nature of his practice. I think that's relevant to know what does he talk about -- so what would intimidate a man like that? What would cause problems for a man like that?

Most importantly, when you see Eric, Eric is a former

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Olympic track and field athlete. He's 6 feet 2, over 220 pounds, in excellent shape.

It's a fact that I am who I am. I never owned a I'm scared of weapons. And I'm a sane man. weapon. you look at his physical and understand what would it take, what kind of email would it take to scare a man like this.

One of the other partners is going to be John Bicks. He's a managing partner of the New York office. John Bicks basically represents -- he's a bankruptcy lawyer for the company. So a company is going out of business, they need a lawyer, John Bicks is the one who is going to go to all the creditors and say, you're not going to get paid or you're going to get paid 10 cents on the dollar.

> Objection, your Honor. MS. SIMON:

THE COURT: I'm going to allow this on the limited basis that I understand the argument is being made that these people are not easily intimidated, as shown by their background. I will -- that's one argument that I think can be made. We'll see whether it's borne out by the facts.

MR. DENNIS: So I mean, I won't go through -- I talk about the other partners who are coming in here. aren't -- I was part of that -- these aren't your everyday people who have nicey nice conversations most of the time. Ιn fact, most of our conversations are pretty tough conversations that we have with each other and that we have with our clients.

It's messages that we have to deliver that no one wants to deliver, but we do.

So going back to -- I want you to look at the complete context of everything that's happening here. One of the things I'll share with you, this is just -- as your Honor mentioned earlier, the Southern District of New York is the most -- is the most -- is the most -- is the best, considered the foremost district in the nation, in terms of where law is developed. And all other courts around the nation follow the Southern District of New York. It's that important in our nation's legal system.

So what you have is, in our Justice Department, you have the best of the best lawyers. So I mean, if you just look at Ms. Kushner, University of Pennsylvania, NYU Law School --

MS. SIMON: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Dennis, although I applaud your bringing forward that Ms. Kushner has a distinguished legal background, it has nothing to do with the issues in this case.

MR. DENNIS: I just wanted to draw the understanding, given the context of the email harassment and the level of fire power that's in this room, and I'll leave it. I think I -- I won't go through, but I can just tell you all of the other are -- legal -- lawyers.

In any event --

THE COURT: No, I think you actually have gone the half hour, but we did have some sidebars, so I'll give you a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

couple more minutes if you need it.

MR. DENNIS: As I stated, again, as you listen to the witnesses and you hear the issue, I just want you to keep -just keep the context in mind, context of this case and just generally. You guys didn't walk in here not reading the news and not reading about what's going on in our legal system and This isn't the first time you heard about emails being used or not being used. This is all -- so you don't -- that's what you bring into the room as a jury, is understanding how the world really works and making sure that the law is applied properly. That's what we want. That's what it starts off with; common law, common sense. And then we built all these things around it. And it's this and that and the other thing, and you've got guys like me, but it started off with common law, meaning common sense. You guys -- I want to thank you. You guys are perfectly equipped and able to evaluate this case and your determination will be a fair and just one.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Please call your first witness.

MS. KUSHNER: Your Honor, the government called Gladys Frias Mora.

GLADY INIAS FRIAS MORA,

called as a witness by the Government,

having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

1 DIRECT EXAMINATION

- 2 BY MS. KUSHNER:
- 3 Q. Good afternoon. Could you please state your name for the
- 4 court reporter.
- 5 A. Gladys Inias Frias Mora.
- 6 Q. And where do you work?
- 7 A. I work for the national police of the Dominican Republic.
- 8 Q. What is your title there?
- 9 A. I am a first lieutenant.
- 10 | Q. Lieutenant Frias, how long have you worked for the national
- 11 police in the Dominican Republic?
- 12 A. Approximately 13 years.
- 13 | Q. And are you assigned to a particular division currently?
- 14 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 15 \parallel Q. What division?
- 16 A. I work for the division for the FBI in the Dominican
- 17 | Republic.
- 18 | Q. And how long have you been in that role for?
- 19 A. Since 2015.
- 20 Q. And what do you do in that role?
- 21 | A. I work as an investigative officer.
- 22 | Q. And as a member of the national police for the Dominican
- 23 Republic, is anyone within that office allowed to work with the
- 24 | FBI?
- 25 | A. No, ma'am.

- 1 Q. And just to be clear, is the FBI also sometimes known as
- 2 | the federal bureau of investigation?
- 3 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 4 Q. What do you have to do as a police officer in the Dominican
- 5 Republic to work with the FBI?
- 6 A. First of all, you have to be a police officer, and then you
- 7 have to pass a polygraph exam so then you can become part of
- 8 the team for the FBI.
- 9 Q. I want to direct your attention to November 16th of 2021.
- 10 Did you arrest anyone that day?
- 11 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 12 | Q. Who did you arrest?
- 13 A. Mr. Willie Dennis.
- 14 | Q. And sitting here today in the courtroom, do you see
- 15 Mr. Willie Dennis?
- 16 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 17 | Q. Can you please describe an article of clothing that he's
- 18 wearing.
- 19 A. He's wearing a blue jacket.
- 20 Q. And where is he sitting exactly?
- 21 A. Practically in front of me.
- 22 MS. KUSHNER: Let the record reflect that the witness
- 23 | has identified the defendant as Willie Dennis.
- 24 THE COURT: Yes.
- 25 BY MS. KUSHNER:

- 1 Lieutenant Frias, what authority did you have to arrest the defendant? 2
- 3 A. We had an arrest warrant and a deportation order against 4 him.
 - Do you know what country issued the arrest warrant?
- Yes, ma'am. 6 Α.

- 7 Which country? Q.
- The United States. 8 Α.
- 9 And where did you arrest the defendant? Q.
- 10 In the province of Puerto Plata in the Dominican Republic. Α.
- 11 And where exactly was the defendant in Puerto Plata?
- 12 He was lodged, he was staying in the penthouse of a hotel
- 13 named as the Magnifico Hotel in Puerto Plata in the Dominican
- 14 Republic.
- Was anyone else in the penthouse? 15 Q.
- 16 Α. No, ma'am.
- I'm showing you what's been marked for identification 17
- 18 purposes. It will probably be on the screen in front of you as
- Government Exhibit 610. 19
- 20 Do you recognize it?
- 21 Yes, ma'am. Α.
- 22 How do you recognize it? Q.
- 23 I recognize it because it was me who took that photograph. Α.
- 24 And what is a photograph of? 0.
- 25 It is a photograph of the block where the penthouse was Α.

3

4

6

9

- 1 | located, the penthouse where Mr. Willie Dennis was staying.
 - Q. Is it a true and accurate photo of the block?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
 - MS. KUSHNER: The government offers Government
- 5 | Exhibit 610 into evidence.
 - THE COURT: Any objection?
- 7 MR. DENNIS: I object, your Honor.
- 8 THE COURT: Overruled.
 - Proceed.
- 10 MR. DENNIS: Can I state why.
- 11 THE COURT: No.
- 12 (Government Exhibit 610 received in evidence)
- 13 THE COURT: Proceed.
- MS. KUSHNER: Can we please publish for the jury
- 15 Government Exhibit 610.
- 16 BY MS. KUSHNER:
- 17 Q. Where exactly is the penthouse in this photograph,
- 18 | Lieutenant Frias?
- 19 A. In the upper left-hand corner.
- MS. KUSHNER: Thank you.
- 21 We can take Government Exhibit 610 down.
- 22 \parallel Q. In addition to arresting the defendant at the penthouse,
- 23 did you do anything else at the penthouse?
- 24 | A. Yes, ma'am.

25

Q. What did you do?

MABGden3

Frias Mora - Direct

1	Α.	We executed a search warrant in the room where he was	
2	staying.		
3	Q.	And did you find anything?	
4	Α.	Yes, ma'am.	
5		(Continued on next page)	
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

MabWden4 Frias - Mora

1 BY MS. KUSHNER:

- 2 | Q. What did you find?
- 3 A. We found electronic devices, money, and documents.
- 4 | Q. I'm showing you what's been marked for identification
- 5 | purposes as Government Exhibit 616. Do you recognize it?
- 6 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 7 MR. DENNIS: Objection, your Honor. The Court has not
- 8 established why the government is presenting this information
- 9 or why Mr. Dennis was in the Dominican Republic in the first
- 10 place. There's no connection.
- 11 THE COURT: That's your cross-examination. I
- 12 understand that's what you want to get into, but that's for
- 13 cross-examination.
- 14 Go ahead.
- 15 BY MS. KUSHNER:
- 16 Q. How do you recognize what's shown in front of you?
- 17 A. Because I was the one who took the photo.
- 18 | Q. And in general, what is it a photo of?
- 19 A. This photo is of the evidence, the items of evidence that
- 20 were recovered in the room that Willie Dennis was staying in.
- 21 | Q. Is it a true and accurate photo of that evidence?
- 22 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 23 | Q. I'm now showing you what's been marked for identification
- 24 purposes as Government Exhibit 616A. Do you recognize this?
- 25 A. Yes, ma'am.

MabWden4 Frias - Mora

- Electronic devices.
- O. Is it a zoomed-in version of Government Exhibit 616?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And is it otherwise a true and accurate photo of the
- electronic devices that were recovered from Willie Dennis's
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
 - MS. KUSHNER: The government offers Government Exhibit 616A into evidence.
 - THE COURT: I take it, Mr. Dennis, that your objection is on grounds of relevance.
 - MR. DENNIS: Yes.
 - THE COURT: Let's have a sidebar.
- (Continued on next page)
- 18

- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

59

1 (At sidebar) THE COURT: What's the relevance? 2 3 MS. KUSHNER: I just want to establish that the cell 4 phone from which all the text messages came from was Willie 5 Dennis's phone, and it was recovered at the time of his arrest. 6 THE COURT: The cell phone that you're later going to 7 introduce the contents of; is that it? MS. KUSHNER: Yes, and because we don't have the 8 9 physical phone, because we returned it, and there's no 10 stipulation, we want to make sure that the phone is tied 11 directly to him. 12 THE COURT: That's right. I granted the return of the 13 phone on the motion made by Mr. Dennis. I think then this is 14 necessary for chain of custody. 15 MR. DENNIS: OK. I object because I don't understand the relevance of showing photographs of money all around as if 16 17 giving the impression to the jury that there's something else 18 going on. She wants to --19 MS. KUSHNER: The purpose is not to introduce that 20 larger photo. 21 THE COURT: No, no, no. I assume, and this is why I 22 overruled your earlier objection, I assume you're going to 23 cross-examine about you were just there, and I don't know 24 whether it was a business trip or a vacation or whatever, but I

doubt very much that this officer will have any independent

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

knowledge of why you were there. So that's fair to bring out. But what they're getting into right now is chain of custody. That, I think, is relevant. MR. DENNIS: I'm not denying chain of custody. I mean they're putting on -- is there a way to short circuit this? THE COURT: Well, you could have stipulated, but you declined to stipulate. That is the point. MR. DENNIS: Maybe Mr. Kelly didn't explain it right. THE COURT: No, no, no. This was --MR. DENNIS: This was recently? THE COURT: Well, the --MR. DENNIS: I mean I don't know. THE COURT: Do you want to stipulate that the phone records they're going to put in later, the phone messages, all came from the phone that was seized from you? MR. DENNIS: Take that under consideration; I don't remember seeing all the phone records. But you're saying these are all the phone records that came from my 646-418-3229number? MS. KUSHNER: Yeah, exactly. MR. DENNIS: Yeah. What's wrong with that? THE COURT: All right. MS. KUSHNER: I just want to be clear on what is being stipulated to. THE COURT: What I'm going to tell the jury right now,

```
to move this along, is that the parties have stipulated that
1
2
      certain records that will be introduced later from a particular
 3
     phone -- you'll give me the number --
 4
               MR. DENNIS: Actually, your Honor, before you -- will
5
      I still get a chance to cross-examine?
6
               THE COURT: Yes.
 7
               MR. DENNIS: I don't want to stipulate. I still want
8
      to have a chance to cross-examine.
9
               THE COURT: OK.
10
               MR. DENNIS: OK.
11
               THE COURT: So let's just go forward.
12
               MR. DENNIS: Yeah, let's go.
13
               (Continued on next page)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 (In open court)

MS. KUSHNER: Just so the record's clear, the 2

3 government is offering Government Exhibit 616A into evidence.

THE COURT: Received.

(Government Exhibit 616A received in evidence)

BY MS. KUSHNER:

- Q. Lt. Frias, what is on the top right-hand side of this photograph?
- 9 MS. KUSHNER: If we could please publish it for the 10 jury. Thank you.
- 11 An Apple brand computer and cell phone, iPhones.
- 12 Q. And are those the two phones right next to the Apple
- 13 computer?

4

5

6

7

- 14 A. Yes, ma'am.
- Showing you what's been marked as Government Exhibit 618, 15 Q.
- 16 do you recognize this?
- 17 Yes, ma'am. Α.
- 18 How do you recognize it?
- 19 I was the person who took that photograph. Α.
- 20 And what is it a photograph of? Ο.
- 21 The photograph is of a gray Apple brand computer and of a
- 22 black iPhone.
- 23 Q. And are these two of the items recovered from the
- 24 defendant's room?
- 25 Yes, ma'am. Α.

MabWden4 Frias - Mora

Q. And is it a true and accurate photograph of those two

2 | items?

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. KUSHNER: The government offers Government Exhibit

5 | 618 into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. DENNIS: No.

THE COURT: Received.

(Government Exhibit 618 received in evidence)

10 BY MS. KUSHNER:

- Q. Lt. Frias, where were you when you took this photo?
- 12 A. To be exact, in the penthouse where Willie Dennis was
- 13 staying.
- 14 | Q. And do you see the white sticker on the back of the phone?
- 15 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 16 Q. Was that sticker already on the phone when you took this
- 17 | photo?
- 18 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 19 MS. KUSHNER: You can take it down.
- 20 | Q. And turning your attention to Government Exhibit 604, do
- 21 | you recognize what's shown here?
- 22 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 23 | Q. How do you recognize it?
- 24 A. I was the person who took that photograph.
- 25 | Q. And what is it a photograph of?

3

4

5

17

Frias - Mora

- It's the photograph of an iPhone cell phone that is black. 1
 - And is it a true and accurate photo of that phone? Q.
 - Yes, ma'am. Α.
 - The government offers Government Exhibit MS. KUSHNER: 604 into evidence.
- 6 Any objection? Mr. Dennis, any objection? THE COURT:
- 7 MR. DENNIS: No objection.
- 8 THE COURT: Received.
- 9 (Government Exhibit 604 received in evidence)
- 10 BY MS. KUSHNER:
- 11 And is this phone the same phone that was photographed in
- 12 Government Exhibit 618?
- 13 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 14 And turning your attention to Government Exhibit 619, do
- 15 you recognize this?
- 16 Yes, ma'am. Α.
 - How do you recognize it? Ο.
- 18 I was the one who took that photograph. Α.
- 19 And what is it a photograph of? Q.
- 20 The photograph is of a gray Apple computer and of a black
- 21 iPhone cell phone.
- 22 Q. And is it a true and accurate photograph of those two
- 23 items?
- 24 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 25 The government offers Government Exhibit MS. KUSHNER:

MabWden4 Frias - Mora

1 | 619 into evidence.

2 | THE COURT: Any objection?

3 MR. DENNIS: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.

(Government Exhibit 619 received in evidence)

BY MS. KUSHNER:

- Q. Is this another photograph of the same phone discussed
- 8 | in --

4

5

6

7

- 9 THE COURT: Counsel, I really think we need to move 10 this along.
- 11 BY MS. KUSHNER:
- 12 | Q. Where were you when you took the photo?
- 13 A. To be exact, in the room where Willie Dennis was staying.
- 14 | Q. Did the search team do anything to keep track of evidence
- 15 | items it recovered from the defendant's room?
- 16 | A. No, ma'am.
- 17 | Q. Did anyone take an inventory of the items that were
- 18 recovered from the defendant's room?
- 19 | A. Yes, ma'am.
 - 0. And when was that done?
- 21 A. While we were carrying out the search warrant.
- 22 | Q. And was that inventory of items memorialized anywhere?
- 23 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 24 | Q. And where were you when the inventory was being written
- 25 down?

- 1 A. Notes were taken while the search warrant was being carried
- 2 out, and then we went to the office of the attorney general,
- 3 | the Dominican Republic attorney general.
- 4 | Q. While the inventory was being written down, do you recall
- 5 whether any identifiers were written down for the cell phones
- 6 | we've been discussing?
- 7 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 8 Q. Do you recall identifiers were written down for that cell
- 9 | phone?
- 10 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 11 | Q. What kind of identifiers?
- 12 | A. The phone's IMEI number and the serial number.
- 13 | Q. And did you know the serial number at the time it was
- 14 | written down?
- 15 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 16 | Q. And were you present when the serial number was written
- 17 down?
- 18 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 19 Q. Was it accurately recorded at the time?
- 20 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 21 | Q. And did you review -- and do you recall the serial number
- 22 of the phone that was written down?
- 23 | A. No, ma'am.
- 24 | Q. I'm showing you what's been marked for identification
- 25 purposes as 3531-04. Is this a reflection of the inventory

MabWden4 Frias - Mora

1 | that was written down at the time of the defendant's arrest?

A. Yes, ma'am.

- Q. Directing your attention to item No. 2, can you please just
- 4 read that to yourself and then look up.
- 5 Does that refresh your recollection as to what serial
- 6 number was written down for the phone at the time?
- 7 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 8 | Q. Can you tell the jury right now, without looking at that
- 9 document -- without looking at that document -- what the serial
- 10 | number is?
- 11 | A. No, ma'am.
- 12 Q. And why not?
- 13 A. It's a very long number.
- 14 | Q. Can you please read the number from the document you're
- 15 | looking at for the jury?
- 16 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 17 Q. Go ahead.
- 18 A. 89014104270935535434.
- 19 \parallel Q. And was that the serial number that was written down?
- 20 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 21 | Q. Where did you ultimately bring the defendant?
- 22 | A. He was brought to the United States.
- 23 | Q. And how do you know that?
- 24 A. Because I was part of the custodial chain for the
- 25 defendant.

MabWden4 Frias - Mora

- 1 Q. Did you travel with the defendant to the United States?
- 2 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 3 | Q. Did you bring anything else with you?
- 4 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 5 | Q. What did you bring?
- 6 A. The evidence that was collected at Mr. Willie Dennis's
- 7 penthouse.
- 8 Q. And how did you get to the United States?
- 9 A. On a commercial flight.
- 10 | Q. Where did you fly in to?
- 11 A. To the United States.
- 12 | Q. Did you fly in to a particular airport?
- 13 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 14 | Q. Where?
- 15 A. Newark.
- 16 | Q. And what day was that?
- 17 | A. November 18, 2021.
- 18 Q. What happened when you arrived at Newark?
- 19 | A. We turned the defendant over to FBI agents together with
- 20 all the evidence that was secured at the penthouse.
- 21 | Q. Including the phone we've been discussing today?
- 22 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 23 | Q. After that, did you have any other involvement in this
- 24 case?
- 25 A. No, ma'am.

3

4

5

6

7

9

1 MS. KUSHNER: One moment.

- Q. Lt. Frias, can you just clarify what you did with the cell phone when you arrived in the United States?
 - A. It was given over as evidence to an FBI agent.
 - MS. KUSHNER: Thank you. No further questions.
- THE COURT: Cross-examination.
 - CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 8 BY MR. DENNIS:
 - Q. Lt. Frias, mucho tiempo.
- I guess the first question I want to ask is I want to

 confirm that the witness was at my apartment the day of the

 arrest.
- THE INTERPRETER: Is that a question, counselor?

 MR. DENNIS: Yes.
- 15 | A. Yes, sir.
- Q. OK. I would like to ask the witness, what does the following phrase mean, "intento de homocidio"?
- THE INTERPRETER: As per the interpreter, attempted homicide.
- 20 A. When a person tries to kill another.
- 21 | Q. OK. And so -- try to phrase this the right way.
- I assume -- well, I will ask. Was the witness aware that
 this was in the -- this was in the papers that were served in
 me, served to me the day that I was arrested?
- 25 A. I don't understand.

```
1
               MR. DENNIS: Before she answers, here's a document
      right here that was served on November 16.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a
 4
               If you want to show a document to the witness --
     minute.
 5
               MR. DENNIS: OK.
6
               THE COURT: -- then just bring it to her. Don't show
 7
      it to anyone else.
8
               MR. DENNIS: OK.
9
               Right here.
10
               THE COURT: Do you recognize this document at all?
11
               THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
12
               THE COURT: OK. What is it?
13
               THE WITNESS: It was an informational notes,
14
      informational notes that were prepared at the office.
15
               THE COURT: OK. Go ahead.
16
               MR. DENNIS: Let me ask her why it was, why I was
17
      given a.
18
               THE INTERPRETER: Counsel, I do not ask questions.
      I'm the interpreter. You ask her.
19
20
               MR. DENNIS: Oh, I'm sorry.
21
      Q. Why was that document given to me?
22
               MR. DENNIS: That's fine.
23
          The day that I was arrested, do you recall me asking -- do
      you recall me asking to be able to see an attorney?
24
```

I don't remember that.

MabWden4 Frias Mora - Cross

- 1 During the ride to Santo Domingo, do you recall me asking 2 to see an attorney?
- 3 Α. No, sir.
- 4 Were you under the impression, based on the language in Q.
- 5 this document, that I was being arrested because I had
- attempted to murder someone? 6
- 7 No, sir. Α.

- What did you interpret my crime to be?
- 9 We only had, sir, an arrest warrant against you.
- 10 How many law enforcement officials were with you that Ο.
- 11 day at the apartment?
- 12 Α. The entire division.
- 13 0. (Laughter) More than ten? Was it more than ten?
- 14 Α. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. And were they all armed?
- 16 Α. Yes, sir.
- 17 MR. DENNIS: Uh-huh.
- 18 Your Honor, I don't have -- can I pass this to the
- 19 jury to see so that they saw just the language?
- 20 THE COURT: No, but I thought you were, forgive me if
- 21 you don't want me to put this question. But the question, I
- 22 thought, based on the sidebar, you were going to put to the
- 23 witness was -- and I'll put it -- did you have any idea why
- 24 Mr. Dennis was present in your country at that time?
- 25 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And don't tell me what it was, but tell me what it was based on. THE WITNESS: Fine. The arrest warrant was an --THE INTERPRETER: The investigation was based on -interpreter's correction. THE WITNESS: The investigation was based on a search warrant and an order of deportation against Mr. Willie Dennis. THE COURT: Deportation from where? THE WITNESS: From the Dominican Republic to the United States. THE COURT: I guess maybe I didn't make my question very clear. Did you know whether Mr. Dennis was there in the Dominican Republic because he was there on business or because he was there on vacation or whether he was there for some other reason? Did you have any knowledge bearing on that? THE WITNESS: Well, I did not know his reasoning or his -- for being there. However, part of the investigation was that Mr. Dennis was a fugitive from the law. THE COURT: Well, I'm going to strike that last part of the answer as not responsive, but we'll keep the first part. I take it, Mr. Dennis, that's the question you were trying to raise at the sidebar. MR. DENNIS: Yes. I would like to ask the witness --

MR. DENNIS: Yeah.

THE COURT: OK. If you want to go further --

MabWden4 1 THE COURT: If you don't want it stricken, that's fine. 2 BY MR. DENNIS: 3 4 Q. Does she know, do you know when I entered the country? 5 THE INTERPRETER: Sir, please do not use the third 6 Speak to the witness directly. person. 7 MR. DENNIS: Oh. 8 THE INTERPRETER: Thank you. 9 THE COURT: So the question is --10 BY MR. DENNIS: When did I enter? When did I enter the Dominican Republic? 11 12 I don't remember that information. 13 Do you know if I entered the Dominican Republic in the fall 0. 14 of 2019? I don't remember that information. 15 Α. How many arrests have you made for email harassment in the 16 17 Dominican Republic? 18 THE COURT: Sustained. Put another question. MR. DENNIS: I don't think I have any further 19 20 questions, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: All right. 22

MR. DENNIS: Would I be able to, if I came back with more, talk to the witness? This is all getting used to -- I really didn't expect --

THE COURT: Well, no. This is your chance to put any

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

questions you wanted to. If you don't have any other questions, we'll hear from the government, and then if they have nothing, we'll excuse the witness.

MR. DENNIS: OK.

THE COURT: Anything from the government?

MS. KUSHNER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you so much. You may step down.

(Witness excused)

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, is it all right if I take a restroom break?

THE COURT: I understand the need for a break, but I was hoping, because we started so late this afternoon --

I'll tell you what, ladies and gentlemen. In a moment of weakness, we're going to let you go now for the day. Don't take it as a precedent, but we will end at 4 o'clock today.

Now, tomorrow, we're going to start promptly at 9:30, so my suggestion is be in the jury room by at least ten minutes before 9:30 so we can start right away.

Have a very good evening. We'll see you soon.

Let me, once again, remind you not to discuss the case with anyone. By the way, I don't think this case is being covered in the papers, but if for any reason you see anything in the media about it, turn away immediately. Don't pay any attention to it, please.

(Continued on next page)

(Jury not present)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, literally, can I just go to the men's room for one second?

THE COURT: Oh, yes. Go ahead. I'm sorry. We'll take a five-minute break, and then we'll resume.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Mr. Dennis, come on up.

I think the only remaining item was we were in the midst of discussing the subpoena to Mr. Bradford Smith of Microsoft, and the jury was ready, so we interrupted.

As I had pointed out, the document portion of the subpoena deals with a lot of things that the Court has already ruled irrelevant in other contexts, in other subpoenas. But I was asking Mr. Dennis if Mr. Smith were called by him as a witness, what is it that you believe Mr. Smith could say that would be helpful to your case.

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, my -- I'm sorry.

In the subpoena, as the judge recognized in any -certainly I don't need the documents. It was really the
witness testimony. As I said in the subpoena application, it
was 12 days after notifying Mr. Smith that, among other
things -- so I just don't want it to be one thing, but I'm
going to give you three or four things. It was 12 days after I
notified Mr. Smith, which was on November 16 of 2020, that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there was strong information, based upon my 14 years of partner at KL Gates and understanding IT and being a technology lawyer and knowing the CTO at the time is now the former CTO, that the servers in -- KL Gates's servers in Beijing, Shanghai, and Taipei had been penetrated by Chinese agents acting for the Chinese Communist Party, and provided him with certain information, which showed that this was based on the information of someone who had been a partner 14 years at the firm, who was very familiar with technology issues, very familiar with spyware, very familiar with -- this wasn't from a labor employment attorney. This was my bread and butter and had been since, since 19 -- 1995, when I basically represented a lot of companies that are now -- or 1996, after Mudge closed, when I started representing a lot of companies that now form, are considered part of Silicon Valley. And 12 days after sending Mr. Smith that email, the indictment was filed against me on October 28, 2020.

And so as we've discussed before, your Honor, I certainly feel, and the more — the more I see is that former U.S. Attorney Berman talked about political influence between June and December of 2020, and certainly I agree with your Honor that he did everything he could to attempt to, you know, not let that happen, but of course, he was out of office. He was not there, and so Senator Durbin decided to look further and decided that it's important, to maintain the public

confidence in the rule of law, to look further into the comments and into, you know, basically some of the things that Mr. Berman said had occurred.

And I, based on all the -- I don't consider them coincidental anymore, the fact that, that the indictment was handed down to me October 28, 2020, and as I was discussing earlier, I understand the influence and power of my partners, because I was there for 14 years. So I believe, and I believe there was, I believe there was influence in this case. I don't -- I mean it was obviously before all of the current attorneys were there. So I mean, you know, with different leadership, but I believe there was influence in getting the indictment --

THE DEPUTY CLERK: We just lost everything.

THE COURT: No, we didn't.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All the computers just went out.

THE COURT: No, they're not. I'm getting it on mine. You may have lost it, but I didn't.

Go ahead.

(Discussion off the record)

THE COURT: I will speak louder.

What I said was that everything that Mr. Dennis just said was dutifully recorded by the reporter, and I can see it on my screen as well.

MR. DENNIS: OK. I think we have a --

MabWden4

THE COURT: All right. The point is — this is familiar territory, Mr. Dennis — you have an elaborate conspiratorial theory that K&L Gates, using their alleged influence, were the ones who orchestrated the indictment against you. It's an interesting theory, but it's one for which there is no nonspeculative information. There's nothing that would be admissible under the rules of evidence to support that theory, even assuming, which I doubt, that that would be in any way, shape, or form relevant to this jury.

If, in fact, the indictment was orchestrated by K&L Gates through their influence, of which I think there is no meaningful evidence whatsoever, but even assuming for the sake of argument that that were true, that has nothing to do with any issue this jury is concerned with. They're concerned with whether there is evidence of whether the charges brought by the grand jury against you are true or false or, more precisely, whether the government has proven the charges beyond a reasonable doubt or failed to do so. So even if your theory were less speculative than it is, your remedy would not be with this jury or with evidence before this jury. You might bring a motion before this Court. You've certainly discussed it before this Court, and I've indicated I don't see any hard evidence of it, but it has nothing to do with this jury, and that's why I'm going to --

MR. DENNIS: Well, just --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DENNIS: The one area that your Honor and I, and obviously the Court's ruling is going — that we, that one factual area is that, and I said, made this argument repeatedly, is that I'm entitled to my right to confront my accuser. Now, how we define my accusers —

THE COURT: Well, I already told you so far as this trial is concerned, those consist of the people who are taking the stand.

MR. DENNIS: And so that where I think we see it is that those partners, and I, from being a partner at that firm, did not and were unable to come in and produce this testimony without first going to the executive management team of the firm and getting their approval. Firms like that do not operate with parties acting unilaterally.

THE COURT: First of all, I'm not going to get into a discussion, although I was a partner at two major firms, but in my recollection, for what it's worth, particularly at Fried Frank, the firm I had the privilege of being with before coming on the bench, was the partners mostly did what they wanted to do.

But more to the point, if you want to cross-examine a witness on the stand, "Before you agreed to testify in this case, did you seek clearance from the executive committee," or something like that, that might be a fair question. That's

very different from what we were just discussing.

I thought, by the way, and this I offer for clarity to the government, even though Mr. Dennis said a lot of irrelevant stuff in his opening statement, one thing he said that I thought was pertinent — and I hadn't thought about before — is I think he is entitled to bring out the, if you will, tough mental state of the alleged victims to show that they would not easily be intimidated and that, furthermore, he knew they wouldn't be easily intimidated, and therefore, he didn't intend to intimidate them; he was just talking in language that they understood, or something like that. So Mr. Dennis, I am going to allow questions along those lines.

MR. DENNIS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I think we've covered everything I wanted to cover. Anything else we need to take up?

I am quashing the subpoena.

MS. KUSHNER: Thank you, your Honor.

The government obviously has no objection to the defendant cross-examining witnesses about the tough mental man's club environment, but we just want to make sure --

THE COURT: I should also note for the record that, of course, the partners at Fried Frank were shy, quiet pussycats, but we'll leave that for another time.

MS. KUSHNER: But in terms of its prejudicial,

inflammatory effect, we would, and the defendant brought this up in his opening, ask that he be precluded from asserting or implying that these lawyers were taking on cases where they just expected the witness to die or where they --

THE COURT: Where they just?

MS. KUSHNER: Expected the witness to die and for asserting that the lawyers were knowingly representing a company that knew what they had done -- that knew that they had done what the plaintiff was alleging they had done to them.

THE COURT: I'm not going to preclude across the board, but I do think a question like that, a specific question, that sounds like improper questioning, but we'll take it one question at a time.

MS. KUSHNER: OK. The other issue raised by the defendant's opening, the Court, of course, had previously ruled that the government could not introduce the fact that he was --

THE COURT: Oh, yes. The door has been opened wide on that. Mr. Dennis, and I can well understand his strategy in that regard, decided to bring out that he had been fired, but now it's fair game for the government to get into that too if you wish.

MS. KUSHNER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DENNIS: Your Honor, one other question. Can the, because I'm representing myself pro se, and I need to prepare

this evening, can the government tell me who their first 1 witness is going to be tomorrow? 2 3 THE COURT: Yes, of course. I was just going to ask 4 them that. Thank you for raising that. 5 Who is your first witness tomorrow? MS. KUSHNER: Your Honor, we're calling Eric Cottle. 6 7 THE COURT: OK. There you are. MR. DENNIS: Any other witnesses, as I'll be preparing 8 9 tonight? Eric Cottle --10 THE COURT: Who do you expect --MR. DENNIS: Who are you calling tomorrow? 11 12 MS. KUSHNER: We anticipate calling Eric Cottle, Jeff 13 Maletta, an AT&T custodian. Those are the next three 14 witnesses. And then Stephen Flatley from the FBI. Prior to 15 that it would be Christian Isolda, also from the FBI. after that it would be John Bicks and then Calvina Bostick and 16 17 then a summary witness. 18 THE COURT: OK. So there you are. 19 I have another matter on the bench here at 4:30, so I 20

think this brings us to a conclusion. We'll see you tomorrow promptly at 9:30.

(Adjourned to October 12, 2022, at 9:30 a.m.)

23

21

22

24

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION
2	Examination of: Page
3	GLADY INIAS FRIAS MORA
4	Direct By Ms. Kushner
5	Cross By Mr. Dennis
6	GOVERNMENT EXHIBITS
7	Exhibit No. Received
8	610
9	616A
10	618
11	604
12	619
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
ļ	